

entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be delivered to the said claimant upon payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$250, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8164. Misbranding of Montauk Santal Comp. U. S. * * * v. 5 Dozen Bottles of Montauk Santal Comp. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11100. I. S. No. 17032-r. S. No. E-1673.)

On August 26, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 5 dozen bottles of Montauk Santal Comp., at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped by G. J. Fajardo, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the Island of Porto Rico, on or about March 27, 1919, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Montauk Santal Comp. Capsules of 5 Minims of Comp. (E. I.) Sandal-wood Oil."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the capsules contained an average of 4.9 minims of a mixture of oils containing approximately 40% of sandalwood oil.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that the labels on the wrappers around the bottles bore a statement to the effect that the capsules contained in the bottles contained "5 Minims of Comp. (E. I.) Sandal-wood Oil," whereas, in fact, the capsules contained a less amount of sandalwood oil. It was alleged in substance that the article was misbranded for the further reason that it was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that certain statements contained in the circulars enclosed with the bottles and wrappers, regarding the curative and therapeutic effects of the article, represented that the article was effective in the treatment of gonorrhœa, usually known as clap, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On November 26, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

8165. Misbranding of Uriseptic Pills. U. S. * * * v. 23 Dozen Bottles * * * of Uriseptic Pills. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11142. I. S. No. 17034-r. S. No. E-1680.)

On September 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 23 dozen bottles of Uriseptic pills, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been invoiced on March 27, and August 24, 1918, and shipped by G. J. Fajardo, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the Island of Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Uriseptic Pills * * * Prepared by Davis & Lawrence Co. New York."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the pills consisted essentially of hexamethylene tetramine, cubebs, santal oil, and kava-kava.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that certain statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effect falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment for gonorrhœa, for acute or chronic inflammation of the bladder or urethra, for gout and other forms of diseases resulting from an attack of gonorrhœa, and as a cure of gonorrhœa and chronic cystitis and gonorrhœa in both sexes, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 5, 1920, the said Davis & Lawrence Co., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

S166. Misbranding of Pildoras Uriseptic. U. S. * * * v. 4 Dozen Bottles of Pildoras Uriseptic. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product ordered released on bond. (F. & D. No. 11143. I. S. No. 17035-r. S. No. E-1679.)

On September 3, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 4 dozen bottles of Pildoras Uriseptic, remaining in the original unbroken packages at San Juan, P. R., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 27, 1918, by G. J. Fajardo, New York, N. Y., and transported from the State of New York into the Island of Porto Rico, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended. The article was labeled in part, "Uriseptic Pills * * * Prepared by Davis & Lawrence Co., Manufacturing Chemists New York."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of methylene blue, cubebs, salol, and kava-kava.

It was alleged in substance in the libel that the article was misbranded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser or purchasers thereof, in that certain statements regarding its curative and therapeutic effect falsely and fraudulently represented it to be effective as a treatment of gonorrhœa, chronic or acute inflammation of the bladder or urethra, and other forms of secondary diseases which generally result from blennorrhagic infection, and cystitis, and as a cure for all inflammations of the genito-urinary tract, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not.

On March 5, 1920, the Davis & Lawrence Co., claimant, having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon the payment of the costs of the proceedings and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$100, in conformity with section 10 of the act.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*